



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,156	06/27/2001	James John Wilson	DN2001117	3836

7590 10/02/2002

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
Patent & Trademark Department - D/823
1144 East Market Street, D/823
Akron, OH 44316-0001

EXAMINER

STEFANON, JUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3682

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/893,156

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL. 4

Examiner

Justin Stefanon

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. Applicant should note that some of the US Patent Numbers listed in the Specification do not match those in the IDS.
2. The information disclosure statement filed June 27, 2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the second sheet appears to be missing, i.e. there is a single sheet, labeled "Sheet 1 of 2", in the file. It has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to on Sheet 1 has been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 5215504 to Wong et al.

Wong et al. disclose a power transmission belt having an inner surface with transverse grooves 18 and grooves 12, which are straight and therefore extend longitudinally. The transverse grooves are not perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the belt. The transverse and longitudinal grooves form rows of cogs 13 which are randomly arranged along the entire length of the belt and have at least six different longitudinal lengths, including three different longitudinal lengths, as seen in figure 2A. No more than four adjacent rows of cogs have the same longitudinal length, as there are no more than four longitudinally adjacent rows of cogs shown on the belt of Wong et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat Nos. 5,055,090 to Miranti, Jr. in view of 5,328,198 to Janne.

In reference to claims 1-4, Miranti, Jr. discloses the claimed invention except for the transverse grooves being not perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the belt. The belt of Miranti, Jr. has cogs of five different longitudinal lengths, which includes three different longitudinal lengths. Miranti discloses a sequence of lengths in which no

more than two adjacent rows of cogs has the same longitudinal length. Janne teaches that it is known to make the transverse grooves not perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the belt. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to align the transverse grooves of Miranti, Jr. at an angle less than 90 degrees relative to the longitudinal direction of the belt as taught by Janne, since Janne teaches that such a modification would eliminate hinge points in the belt.

In reference to claim 5, since there is no showing of unexpected results associated with the claimed sequence, it is seen as an obvious matter of design choice to provide the belt of Miranti, Jr. with the claimed sequence as an obvious variant of a random pattern of longitudinal lengths.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art shows various belts utilizing different and random cog lengths as well as non-perpendicular grooves.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin Stefanon whose telephone number is 703-305-1945. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 6 - 3:30, alternate Fridays off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Bucci can be reached on 703-308-3668. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 3682

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

js
September 25, 2002


DAVID A. BUCCI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600